

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 of the patent application were presented for examination. In the Office Action of June 23, 2008, claims 1-18 were rejected. The claims, as amended, are listed above. No claims were cancelled. No claims were added. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are now pending for examination.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims and respond to the Office Action as follows:

Interview Summary

On August 13, 2008, Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed the rejections by telephone. After discussing various interpretations of claim 1 with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112(1), 112(2) and 101, the parties reached agreement. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 were not discussed.

As a result, independent claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended to further clarify that the functions of a messaging system are part of the database system, not the messaging system itself. Furthermore, claims 1, 7 and 13 was amended to clarify that messaging system and database system are separate applications. The parties agreed that these amendments would overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112(1), 112(2) and 101.

Claim Objections

Claims 6, 12 and 18 were objected to because of informalities. Examiner required that the limitation "publish/ subscribe" be clarified as either publish AND subscribe, or as publish OR subscribe.

In response, these claims have been amended to recite "publish and subscribe." One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the publish/ subscribe model as allowing a publisher to publish content and allowing a subscriber to subscribe to the content in a decoupled process.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112(1)

Claims 1, 7 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, Examiner alleged that independent claims 1, 7 and 13 recite that the message system is separate from the database, which was not set forth in the original disclosure, and thus, was new matter.

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112(2)

Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Examiner stated it was unclear now the messaging system can be both “in a database system” and “separate from a database system.”

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because Examiner asserted that the claimed invention was inoperable. Specifically, Examiner stated that whereas the message system is separate from the database system in independent claims 1, 7 and 13, there would be no access or communication between the systems, thus disabling any possible messaging functionality in the database system. The remaining claims depend upon the rejected independent claims.

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 6-7, 12-13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cusson et al. (U.S. Patent 4,487,641) ("Cusson").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

For ease of examination, independent claim 1 is reproduced below as illustrative of independent claims 7 and 13. Claim 1 is directed towards a method for integrating messaging functionality into database operations on a computer system. The method comprises:

- (a) providing one or more chosen functions in a database system, the one or more functions provided by a messaging system; and
- (b) utilizing one or more chosen functions from the database system within structured query language statements to access the messaging system from the database system, wherein the messaging system is a separate application from the database system.

Cusson generally discloses middle-tier Web server with a queryable cache that contains items from one or more data sources (Abstract). Cusson also discloses an action performed to place a message in an update query of a message queue 414 (11:12-13). FIG. 4 of Cusson illustrates a message queue 243 and a source database 241.

However, Cusson fails to teach or suggest the claims as recited in claim 1.

A. *Cusson Fails to Disclose Providing One or More Chosen Functions in a Database System, the One or More Functions Provided by a Messaging System*

Claim 1 provides messaging functionality to a database system. The Office Action points to a citation in which the “message queue...is implemented as an Oracle advanced queue.” (Cusson 11:13-14). Thus, rather than providing messaging functionality to a database system as in claim 1, Cusson implements a messaging queue as a database. The database of Cusson, in storing the data associated with messaging, is still unable to use the functionality of messaging, as in claim 1. Cusson has no further disclosures related to this limitation.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1, 7 and 13, and all dependent claims, are patentable for at least these reasons.

B. *Cusson Fails to Disclose Utilizing One or More Chosen Functions From the Database System Within Structured Query Language Statements to Access the Messaging System From the Database System, Wherein the Messaging System is a Separate Application From the Database System*

Claim 1 also recites a messaging system that is a separate application from the database system. As discussed above, the messaging queue of Cusson is implemented as a database. Thus, these elements of Cusson are not separate.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites utilizing SQL statements to access the messaging system from the database system. While FIG. 4 shows the message queue 243 as a separate component from source database 241, Cusson fails to disclose any interaction amounting to utilizing SQL statements to access the messaging system from the database system, as in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1, 7 and 13, and all dependent claims, are patentable for these additional reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 2-5, 8-11 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Cusson over Chandra et al. (U.S. Patent 6,058,389)(“Chandra”).

Because these claims depend upon patentable base claims (as discussed above), and because Chandra fails to cure the deficiencies of Cusson, these claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the base claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

August 20, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 45728

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549